

Arizona Tribal Strategic Partnering Team

Attendees and Guests		
Nathan Banks, FHWA	Ron Hall, CSU	Joy Keller-Weidman
Michael Bends, San Xavier	Mark Hodges, ADOT	Guests:
Nathan Barrett, San Xavier	Robert Maxwell, BIA	Grant Buma, CRIT
Barney Bigman, San Carlos	David Silversmith, NDOT	Doug Torres, GRIC
Eileen Colleran, ADOT	Bill Pederson, ADOT	Sasha Saliego, GRIC
Esther Corbett, ITCA	Stan Robbins, Apache County	Vickie Begay, BIA
Misty Dayzie, ADOT	Myra (Rusty) Rothman, ADOT	Ruth Greenspan, ADOT
Michelle Fink, ADOT	Manuel Sanchez, FHWA	

Facilitator: Joy Keller-Weidman, Holon Consulting

See Attached roster for contact information.

Agenda Items & Highlights

KEY OUTCOMES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Identify current local tribes' needs & gap <input type="checkbox"/> Develop a basic outline of an Outreach Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Clarify ATSPT focus and membership

TOPIC	DETAILS
◆ Introductions	Welcome by Joy Keller Weidman
◆ Opening and Welcome	Introductions of Partnership groups that were present

TOPIC	DETAILS
Action Items Update	See attached Updated Action Items

TOPIC
◆ PRESENTATIONS, MEMBERS' INPUT & Q & A

DETAILS
<p><u>ITCA present local tribes' needs and gaps in services</u> (Esther Corbett)</p> <p><i>Topics identified before the meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Crash data (ongoing coordination between ADOT TRC, BIA Safety Office and NHTSA) -Roadside maintenance: vegetation management (need coordination between safety and environmental staff) -Innovative financing (e.g. loan programs) -Tribal COG/MPO concept -Access management -Safe Routes to School Program (bringing these workshops out to more tribes)

Esther handed out a Crash Data bar chart and history of the issues for American Indians
1998 was 75.9 mortality rate compared to State rate of 20.4
2008 was 40.6 fatality rate compared to 13.4% for the State

IHS does not have the care available on site, patients must be air evacuated to private hospitals, and the data rarely gets back to the ITCA. GOHS council worked the crash data and hospital data, and ASU helped improve the way info was compiled. Causes money spent on contract services rather than increasing the level of care on the reservations. Overlapping zip codes for tribal data causes discrepancies and funding issues. Road number system is different on tribal land vs. State or BIA numbers, mapping system needs to be improved. Indian allotments are being left out of the data, or put into special categories.

Crash Data Contact Mark Hodges at ADOT

Crash Data on tribal lands, contact Bob Maxwell, BIA

1. Retirements and vacancies are creating a void in policy and communications
2. Project 18 – improvements in the ALIS database and Safety Mart, to create online downloads
3. Level of project assignments – access is being decided and how they will access the info
4. Right now ITCA is having difficulty downloading the info, Risk Management determine who can view the data
5. Traffic Records has picked up the responsibility
6. Establishing categories on the database as a dropdown menu to filter the variety of names of the roads for consistency and accurate reporting

Tribal COG/MPO concept discussion

Suggestion – Washington State has developed this and it is working well - WestDot

1. Provide ADOT the feedback that they need on rural communities
2. Focus on the problem of tourism traffic on the rural areas

Suggested steps to take:

1. What is the authority to establish a tribal COG – start with the Governor's office - ITCA could lead?
2. Legislative process
3. Need a Plan of Action: Develop steps and deadlines
4. One Lead Tribe to support and bring others in: be the Champions of the document
5. Safety issues and promoting tribal safety
6. After the funding is available: Notify other tribal governments to be aware of this proposal and provide input. Intention or possibility to be explained to others. Back up and ownership of the concept and opportunity to be engaged in developing the establishment of this Tribal COG.

Motor vehicles are considered a leading health hazard for the tribes

1. Accidents on State Routes aren't only tribal members, but due to increased tourists and commerce traveling through the reservations
2. Data management system developed a State Route and a BIA route
3. Working with ADOT on Highway Improvement system
4. Published the AZ Strategic Highway Safety Plan manual

5. Currently working on updating the ALIS data and new trends (Young drivers, roadside improvements, speeding and impaired driving)
6. New white paper on roadside improvements

Roadside maintenance: vegetation management

1. Vegetation Issues of plant growth up to the shoulder of the roadway, animals often in the ROW and causes problems for vehicles, bikes and pedestrians
2. New vegetation management plan established
3. If a safety or hazardous issues comes up – directly go to the ADOT district
4. Coordination issues – with ADOT and within the tribes and throughout the government agencies

Suggested Steps – ADOT District maintenance of the ROW vegetation – recommends contacting the DE and for safety or hazardous issues in ROW. The budget has created an impact on mowing vs. snowplowing services. Paul Langdale at ADOT can assist

Safe Routes to School Program (bringing these workshops out to more tribes)

1. Healthy people and healthy modes of transit need to be established
2. High pedestrian rate, lack of sidewalks and bus stops on the rural roads
3. Transportation capacity building – still needs more attention, identify walkabouts to access the area, terrific tool to use with the tribes and agencies, with successful outcomes
4. Create livable communities and all the components to increase safety and security
5. Healthy lifestyles studies need to be addressed and need more flexibility for the tribal areas
6. Modeled on city, school, and street settings – Application process pointed out that the settings were very different in rural areas
7. Safe school buses – who do we give the responsibility to?
8. Walkabout exercise with ADOT before doing the grants, prior to applying for them.

Two tribes have applied for the funds

1. Tribes could not apply directly to the DOT's, must use non profit agency to qualify

San Carlos feedback:

2. Safe Routes to Schools needs more connection with ADOT and tribes – rural vs. cities/towns
3. Grant funding data is not available – competing against statistical data from other towns, that data is not available on the tribal lands
4. PARA funding is being researched
5. SATS grants – realize that it is competitive and that data does not satisfy the grant guidelines
6. Sovereignty Rights – for the duration and area of the projects- not specified or defined
7. Interpretation of rules
8. Split funding between rural and urban and recommend changes to guidelines
9. Different standards for rural vs. urban communities
10. Focused on the rules VIA DOT- needs assessment – tribes never has enough funding to resolve the issues
11. Seasonal traffic in rural areas, due to tourism, puts pressure on the roads and the towns.
12. Data transfer is kept private – how to protect the data and the tribe? Benchmark Caltrans method to do needs assessment and how they implement the tools to apply to assist the tribes.

-Innovative financing (e.g. loan programs)

1. GRIC DOT- approval to work on the road was difficult – GRIC provided the equipment
2. Social aspects of sidewalks, curbs, bike lanes, lighting, and pedestrians travel
3. Can't wait 5 to 10 years for improvements while funds are being established
4. Applying for grants is a complex application process – learning process in how those applications are filled out- trial and error method. Competing with Globe or Safford statistics – no way to compete with the data to obtain grants
5. Technical Expertise is needed – shared resources and services
6. BIA Right of Way handbook – allotments that cross nation lines
7. Training is offered, permission process, waiver situations, learning experience
8. Need specific Tribal Government Data – need a application process specifically for the tribes
9. FHWA– bring forward the tribal needs and issues, but not just the rural needs, this group can provide assistance with the tribal needs

Suggestion – distribution of funding – analysis of money spent per capita and per area
 Raise awareness and attention of the Department to take to the ADOT Board and affect the 5 year transportation plan. Unfair to put a \$0 for a county especially when they have seasonal tourism traffic on their roads affecting the local population

Suggestion: MOU or IGA and the data can be used only on specific projects – the tribes need to start the process

BIA Agency Engineers present local tribes' needs - Vicki Begay on telecom

ITCA lead a very good dialogue and glad to hear that ATSPT is working on these issues.
 Bob Maxwell – central office approval needed on safety issues and changes
 2% planning of BIA funds – educate the tribes to use this source
 ROW issues – working with ADOT and the Tribes
 BIA is not adding new BIA roads – identified as tribal or state routes

TRIBAL NEEDS/GAPS AND OUTREACH STRATEGIES CHART

Based on the discussion above

PERSPECTIVE: CURRENT NEEDS	GAPS	STRATEGIES FOR OUTREACH
<p>Discrepancy in Funding awareness re Urban vs. Rural</p> <p>Access management on rural land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tribes not applying for grants • Awareness of discrepancy in 	<p>Data & funds spent on Rural and Urban</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rural Setting for Safe Routes to Schools 	<p>Strategies for Outreach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key tribe partners to go forward with other tribes input – approach Sate about Tribal COG (see next steps) 2. (Include Katosha, Policy

Revised 4/20/10

<p>funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2% planning get from BIA more funds • Allotted lands – Land maintenance – ROW, sidewalks, lighting <p>BIA handbook (ROW approval)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROW • Allotments • Different situation 		<p>Advisor from the Governor’s Office)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Model the process that Washington, Minnesota, New Mexico to develop 4. Which includes gaining approval from the Governor first then going to the State tribes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct Study to identify funds spent per area per capita for urban vs. rural (affects the 5 year plan) • Take study results to the Board <p>Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Involve the San Carlos Apache Tribe at the beginning stage so they would champion the study.
<p>Safe routes to School (issues) Tribes Access to funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application – lack of success • Discrepancy in Tribal Crash Data (negative portrayal) • IT technical capability not there • Can’t apply directly to ADOT, must use a nonprofit agency 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accurate Crash Data <p>Invite ADOT Traffic Engineering rep to safety issue topic – ITCA needs to be informed of the process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian safety • MOU & IGA crash data used only for certain purposes • Who should be responsible for this? • Modeled on city, school or street setting – not rural tribal land 	<p>Educate Tribes re: Add funding sources</p> <p>Use Walkabouts as training tool to gather information</p>
<p>Lack of understanding the uniqueness of the tribes, population base, cultural, physical, political sovereign nations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Different in warrants – different standards for urban vs. rural regarding warrants b. Tribes have unique population base c. Physical data a statistical data d. Cannot compete with urban and rural 	<p>Coordination process for tribes to follow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process for Safety Issues <p>BIA, ADOT, FHWA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination issue: Safety ADOT & Tribes 	<p>Invite Traffic Environmental ADOT rep to Safety issues topic and coordinate with all ADOT Divisions & partners to understand the process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invite ADOT Traffic Engineer to ASTPT 2. Crash data accurate to address

ATSPT Meeting Notes
 March 29, 2010

	<p>e. Need for ADOT to fully understand sovereignty rights of tribes f. Seasonal tourist traffic pressure on communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility and Oversight • Confidential data transfer 	<p>speed limits changes</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">ROW Issues</p>	<p>Better understand tribal realities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical • Cultural • Political <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider schedule ADOT/FHWA to visit each tribe for a walkabout of the site to understand the safety conditions 2. Trails and sidewalks 3. Walkabouts for road safety assessments 4. Safe roads to school 5. More IGA crash data used only for certain purposes
		<p>Funding Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different way for ADOT to work the tribes on Grant funding • Distribution of funding projects • Finding funding sources • Tribes: have a say in ARRA Funding 	<p>Improve Accuracy of data and accessibility of data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statistical data (current accurate data from the tribes) 2. Consider split funding between rural & urban areas 3. Develop electronic data system to get the missing data

	<p>Application Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways to successfully apply as rural Tribe community • Tribal COG/MPO to help tribes complete: example Washington State DOT • BIA only look at Roads and not social issues & government • RE: Safety • Federal gov't develop different application process Specifically for tribes 	<p>Promote tribes success with Safe Routes to School Application process and access to funding</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training exercise (re: safe routes to school) 2. FHWA meet with staff to discuss interpretation of application rules 3. Develop a contact book for tribes about safety issues (to go to during the process)
--	---	---

<p>TOPIC</p>
<p>◆ Plan for Outreach: Based on needs assessment and gaps: shift from a large annual forum to face to face meetings with groups of small number of tribes, designed to meet individual tribe's prioritized needs. See Planning chart below:</p>

OUTREACH PLANNING CHART

GAPS	STRATEGIES	By when
<p>Discrepancy in Funding awareness re Urban vs. Rural</p>	<p>◆ Obtain Data re: funds spent on Rural and Urban</p>	<p>May</p>
<p>Safe routes to School (issues) Tribes Access to funding Application – lack of success</p>	<p>◆ Accurate Crash Data needed ◆ Invite ADOT Traffic Engineering rep to safety issue topic – ITCA needs to be informed of the process</p>	<p>May</p>

<p>Lack of understanding the uniqueness of the tribes, population base, cultural, physical, political sovereign nations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Coordination process for tribes to follow regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Safety Issues ➤ ROW issues ➤ Funding Sources ◆ Application Process 	<p style="text-align: center;">May</p>
--	---	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Complete PEP and review Dec. 2009 PEP results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Team reviewed ratings over past year, which were favorable. ◆ Team members completed and submitted PEP ratings for March 2010 ◆ Michelle will input PEP ratings for this quarter. Team members prefer this approach and will revisit the decision if needed.

TOPIC	DETAILS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Next quarterly meeting date and agenda items 	<p><u>Monday, June 7, 8:30-Noon; ADOT-HRDC training room</u> SAFETY ISSUES FOR TRIBES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Invite Mr. Brian Fellows – Safe Routes to Schools (Misty to invite) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Funding ➤ Process ➤ Issues ◆ Invite Federal and State representatives ◆ Invite Traffic Engineering rep – Misty

TOPIC	DETAILS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Closing Comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Thanks for coming and sharing thoughts ◆ Excited to see the push for the Tribal COG ◆ Great participation and representation at the meeting ◆ Hope this participation level continues ◆ Thanks for the GOTO meeting opportunity

ACTION PLAN

NEXT STEPS:

Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Discuss possibilities of research study and gain approval from MPD Director (Jennifer Toth) <input type="checkbox"/> Investigate Funds spent on Tribal lands and develop chart (Current allocation based on existing formula.) 	Misty Dayzie	April

Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Touch base with all 22 tribes: send them a summary of the intention to fund a research study regarding the benefits/costs of a tribal COG/entity 	Misty Dayzie	Before decision about the study

Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Pursue a Grant to fund the study (ITCA focus group - propose model)? <input type="checkbox"/> Meet with ADOT Director & ITCA Director <input type="checkbox"/> Contact Anne Ellis and Diane <input type="checkbox"/> Look to ADOT's research office to fund a study or federal SPR funds <input type="checkbox"/> Supply the data – who, what, where, when etc 	Misty, Nate, Esther, Grant Misty Dayzie Misty Dayzie Nate Banks	April

Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Investigate ATRC as a funding source for study of analyze the benefits vs. cost of a tribal COG 	Misty Dayzie	After MPD approval

Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pursue the Tribal COG: Can ATSPT promote and facilitate this process of initial communication? 2. Look for funds to pay for investigative costs Determine Tribal Champion or lead 3. Meet with tribal leaders to discuss Tribal COG 4. Review results 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eileen, Misty, Bill, Michelle 2. Esther Corbett 3. Esther Corbett & Eileen 4. ATSPT 	ASAP

Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Research the Tribal COG: <input type="checkbox"/> Develop a plan of action <input type="checkbox"/> ATSPT to review the proposal 	Barney Bigman Misty Dayzie Ron Hall	April

Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<input type="checkbox"/> Take the research document to Governor's Office	Esther Corbett - ITCA	After results are published
Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<input type="checkbox"/> Identify a back up plan to research funding sources: such as TTAP, CTIP funds, or NRC.	Misty Dayzie	
Action	Responsible Person(s)	By when
<input type="checkbox"/> Organize presentation for ATSPT committee	Ron Hall	Sept?
<input type="checkbox"/> Invite Mr. Brian Fellows – Safe Routes to Schools to June 7 Steering committee meeting	Misty Dayzie	April
<input type="checkbox"/> Invite Safety staff members to June 7th Steering committee meeting	Nate Banks	April

MEETING FEEDBACK – Based on 14 evaluations

1. How valuable was this partnership meeting for you? Average Rating 3.64

This meeting was not valuable 0.5 1.0 1.5	This meeting was somewhat valuable 2.0 2.5 (1)	This meeting was valuable 3.0 3.5(7)	This meeting was very valuable 4.0 (6)
---	---	---	--

2. What about this partnership meeting was most valuable to you?

- ◆ It was great having the large number of new ATSPT members present
- ◆ 1st time at this meeting, it was very informational
- ◆ More participants than in the past
- ◆ Wide range of issues were helpful to know specifics
- ◆ Appreciate everyone's participation
- ◆ Discussion on Tribal COG and SRTS
- ◆ Bringing together Reps from all agencies stakeholders – ADOT, BIA, FHWA, ITCA, Tribes without having to many voices
- ◆ Meeting the people
- ◆ Very well attended meeting! 20 people here and 4 on the GOTO meeting. Very interesting dialogue on Tribal COG and Safe Roads to School.
- ◆ Communication with ADOT
- ◆ This was my first ATSPT meeting and it was very valuable for me to learn more about what the team is doing and to meet the team members.
- ◆ San Xavier's attempts and inability to obtain funds under the 'safe routes to schools' program – urban vs. rural needs
- ◆ More participants and participation

3. What would have improved the effectiveness of this partnership meeting?

Revised 4/20/10

ATSPT Meeting Notes
 March 29, 2010

- ◆ Closer attention to the agenda
- ◆ Need more tribal participation
- ◆ Have more tribes involved on the issues
- ◆ Key figures to answer questions and enter into discussion
- ◆ Ran out of time to discuss all of the topics
- ◆ ADOT Board Representative
- ◆ More tribal Representatives – (i.e. TOH, Ft. Apache, Hualapai at the meetings)
- ◆ More tribes to participate

4. How do you rate the effectiveness of the Facilitators/Presenters? Average Rating 3.64

Was not effective 0.5 1.0 1.5	Was somewhat effective 2.0 2.5 (1)	Was effective 3.0 (1) 3.5(5)	Was very effective 4.0 (7)
--	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------

- ◆ Kept the meeting moving forward
- ◆ Good job Joy and Michelle
- ◆ Joy covered a lot of topics and kept us on schedule

5. How do you rate this partnership’s potential for partnering? Average Rating 3.53

This partnership has no potential for partnering 0.5 1.0 1.5	This partnership team has some potential for partnering 2.0 2.5	This partnership team has good potential for partnering 3.0 (4) 3.5 (5)	This partnership team has very good potential for partnering 4.0 (5)
---	---	---	---

- ◆ The teams potential will depend on continued involvement of the new ATSPT members
- ◆ Staff can start a possibility of partnering
- ◆ Excellent potential when representation is diverse
- ◆ Great ideas and dialogue – good commitment by the team members present – keep attending the meetings.

6. What other comments do you wish to offer?

- ◆ More information on how additional tribes can officially partner with ADOT. However, a rehash of same topics at the ITCA meetings.
- ◆ Good communications
- ◆ We will plan to be her in June for the next meeting
- ◆ Establishment of a Tribal Cog will go along way in improving tribal/state coordination and cooperation and give Tribes access to National Transportation funding
- ◆ Safe Rotes to School was a good topic for discussion. Out on Navajo, we see the need from the county but who do we ask to provide those services? The same with school bus turn outs

Next meeting is June 7 from 8:30-Noon at HRDC.